

### **REMARKS**

Upon entry of the instant Amendment, Claims 1-3 and 5-9 and 12 are pending. Claims 10 and 11 have been cancelled. The Applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of claim 12. Claim 12 has been amended in order to correct an antecedent basis problem. Thus, claim 12 should be allowable. A replacement drawing is enclosed. It is respectfully submitted that upon entry of the instant Amendment, the application is in condition for allowance.

### **DRAWINGS**

Figure 7 has been amended so that the reference character designated to the side wall is now "76." The specification has been amended accordingly. A replacement sheet is enclosed. It is respectfully submitted that the drawings now comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) now that all reference characters refer to unique parts.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 11 has been amended to more particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claim 11 has been cancelled. Thus this rejection is obviated.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 5, 6, and 8-10 haven been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakuma et., Japanese Patent No. 07-306378<sup>1</sup> in view of Pokrinchak, U.S. Patent No. 4,510,708<sup>2</sup>. The limitations of claims 10 and 11 have been incorporated into claim 1.

---

<sup>1</sup> This reference is identified in the Detailed Action as Patent No. 07-306376. However, the Applicant believes the correct number is 07-306378

<sup>2</sup> Based on the comments on Page 4 of the Detailed Action, it appears that rejection is also based upon Pokrinchak US Patent No. 4,510,708.

Claim 10 has been cancelled. Thus, the rejection is obviated with respect to claim 10. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness as set forth in MPEP § 2143. In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three criteria must be met as set forth in MPEP § 2143.

“First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in the Applicant’s disclosure.”

First of all two (2) references are being combined without any showing as required by MPEP § 2143 that there was any suggestion or motivation to combine the references as suggested by the Examiner. Secondly, it is respectfully submitted that none of the references, either singly or in combination, teach all of the elements of the claims. For example, all of the claims recite a housing formed with a viewing window configured as a **clipboard** forming a portable viewer. Neither, the Japanese reference nor the Pokrinchak references disclose such a configuration. For the above reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 5, 6, 8 and 9.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakuma in view of Pokrinchak, and further in view of Hill U.S. Patent No. 5,174,607. Claim 7 is dependent on claim 1. The Pokrinchak patent has been discussed above as applied to claim 1. The Hill patent was cited for teaching an “illuminated” clipboard made of plastic. The applicant respectfully disagrees with the characterization of the Hill patent. It is respectfully submitted


that the portable clipboard disclosed in the Hill '607 patent is not illuminated. Indeed, the Hill patent discloses a clipboard that is removable from the base. Notwithstanding, the Hill patent does not disclose or suggest a system as recited in the claims at issue. For these reasons and the above reasons, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claims 2 and 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakuma in view of Pokrinchak, and further in view of Abrams, U. S. Patent 4,751,615. Claims 2 and 3 are dependent on claim 1. The Pokrinchak patent has been discussed above as applied to claim 1. The Abrams patent discloses a page light and does not otherwise disclose a portable film viewer as recited in the claims at issue. The Abrams patent was cited for disclosing a battery powered device. The Abrams patent relates to a page light and does not relate to a film viewer. For these reasons and the reasons above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pokrinchak in view of Wright et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,751,620. Claim 11 has been cancelled. Thus, this rejection is obviated.

Respectfully submitted,

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP

By:   
John S. Paniaguas  
Registration No. 31,051

Date: 10-25-05

Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP  
525 West Monroe Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60661-3693  
Tel: (312) 902-5200  
Fax: (312) 902-1061